

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

9:30 AM

**1:00-00000**

**Chapter**

**#0.00 This calendar will be conducted remotely, using ZoomGov video and audio.**

Parties in interest and members of the public may connect to the video and audio feeds, free of charge, using the connection information provided below.

Individuals may participate by ZoomGov video and audio using a personal computer (equipped with camera, microphone and speaker), or a handheld mobile device (such as an iPhone or Android phone). Individuals may opt to participate by audio only using a telephone (standard telephone charges may apply).

Neither a Zoom nor a ZoomGov account is necessary to participate and no pre-registration is required. The audio portion of each hearing will be recorded electronically by the Court and constitutes its official record.

Video/audio web address: <https://cacb.zoomgov.com/j/1606130988>

Meeting ID: 160 613 0988

Password: 722558

Dial by your location: 1 -669-254-5252 OR 1-646-828-7666

Meeting ID: 160 613 0988

Password: 722558

Docket 0

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

9:30 AM

**1:17-10557    Dat Phuc Nguyen**

**Chapter 13**

**#1.00    Motion for relief from stay**

ARMANDO CARRASCO

fr. 8/11/21

Docket      46

**Tentative Ruling:**

Parties submitted a stipulation to continue to November 17, 2021 to attend a mediation on this matter. No order was submitted granting the stipulation and nothing has been filed since the stipulation was filed on August 10, 2021. What is the status of this case?

Appearance Required.

Previous Tentative:

Petition Date:        March 6, 2017  
Service: Proper. Opposition filed.  
Chapter 13 Plan confirmed: Oct. 16, 2017

Movant: Armando Carrasco  
Relief Sought to:    Pursue Pending Litigation XX    Commence Litigation  
\_\_\_\_\_                                  Pursue Insurance \_\_\_\_\_    Other

Litigation Information

Case Name: Carrasco v. Café Orient, et al.  
Court/Agency:        Los Angeles Superior Court  
Date Filed: Sept. 22, 2020  
Judgment Entered: n/a  
Trial Start Date: 8/3/2021

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

9:30 AM

**CONT...      Dat Phuc Nguyen**

**Chapter 13**

Action Description: discrimination; wrongful termination; wage and hour violations

Grounds

Bad Faith \_\_\_\_ Claim is Insured \_\_\_\_ Claim Against 3rd Parties \_\_\_\_  
Nondischargeable \_\_\_\_

Mandatory Abstention \_\_\_\_ Non-BK Claims Best Resolved in Non-BK Forum  
XX

Other:

Movant Carrasco, a former employee of Debtor's restaurant Café Orient, worked for Debtor from approx. February 2015 until March 2019. Motion for RFS, Ex. A. Movant alleges that the work conditions that violate Labor and other Codes began before the petition date, sometime in September 2016, and continued through March 2019. Movant argues that this non-bankruptcy action for employment violations is best resolved in state court and contends that there are grounds for annulment because he filed his complaint on Sept. 22, 2020 without notice or knowledge of the bankruptcy filing.

Debtor opposes the Motion, arguing that payments under Debtor's chapter 13 plan are due to be completed on or about March 2022 - approximately 8 months. Debtor explains that, at the time this case was filed, he did not know (or have reason to know) that Movant had any claims against him. Debtor request the Court allow him to complete this case and deny the relief requested by Movant. If the Court is inclined to grant relief, however, Debtor maintains that relief should be conditioned to allow Movant to pursue only those claims (if any) that arose after this case was filed on March 6, 2017.

Given the timing of the actions that were alleged to have violated state labor and employment law, Movant may have a claim against the estate for any portion of the damages that accrued prepetition. The claim will need to be liquidated and it is prudent to have that done in the state court. Whether any judgment rendered in favor of Movant would create a claim against the estate is an issue appropriately resolved here, after the claim is liquidated.

Disposition: GRANT under 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1). GRANT relief requested in

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

9:30 AM

**CONT...**

**Dat Phuc Nguyen**

**Chapter 13**

paragraphs 2 (proceed under non-bankruptcy law to judgment, with stay against enforcement without further order of this Court); 3 (stay annulled retroactively to the bankruptcy petition date); and 5 (waiver of the 4001(a)(3) stay).

DENY request for binding and effective relief under paragraph 6 and 7, as no bad faith is alleged as to Debtor's conduct in this bankruptcy case.

**APPEARANCE REQUIRED**

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Dat Phuc Nguyen

Represented By  
Bobby Samini

**Movant(s):**

Armando Carrasco

Represented By  
Dawn Ly

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

9:30 AM

**1:18-12790    Frank Vincent Ciraci and Millicent Helen Whiteside**

**Chapter 13**

**#2.00    Motion for relief from stay**

SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, INC.

fr. 4/7/21, 5/19/21; 7/28/21

Docket      53

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\*    REASON: Continued to January 5, 2022 at 10:00am.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

VACATED: Continued to January 5, 2022 at 10:00am.

No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Frank Vincent Ciraci

Represented By  
Steven L Bryson

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Millicent Helen Whiteside

Represented By  
Steven L Bryson

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

9:30 AM

**1:19-12533 Stuart Malin and Patricia Malin**

**Chapter 13**

**#3.00** Motion for relief from stay

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO.

fr. 10/28/20, 6/30/21; 8/18/21; 9/29/21

Docket 44

**Tentative Ruling:**

This hearing was continued so that the parties could work out a loan modification. Nothing has been filed since the last hearing. What is the status of this Motion?

**APPEARANCE REQUIRED**

Previous Tentative Below:

Petition Date : 10/06/2019

Confirmation Date: 04/16/2020

Service: Proper. Opposition filed on 10/9/2020 (Docket No. 48)

Property: 7718 Maestro Avenue, Los Angeles, California 91304

Property Value: \$ 900,000 (per debtor's schedules)

Amount Owed: \$462,609.56 (per Movant's declaration)

Equity Cushion: 48.59%

Equity: \$437,390.44

Post-Petition Delinquency: \$24,009.37 ( 22 payments of \$2,090.85, \$1,030.00, less suspense account \$19.98).

Movant requests relief under 11 U.S.C.362(d)(1), with specific relief requested in paragraphs 2 (proceed under non-bankruptcy law); 3 (option to enter into a loan modification) and 7 (waiver of the 4001(a)(3) stay). Movant alleges that the Debtor has missed postpetition payments. The last partial postpetition payment occurred on 2/27/20.

The Debtor opposes this motion and asserts that the Movant is not taking additional payments into account. Further, the Debtor attempted to get a hardship modification or Covid relief but the lender failed to follow through.

There is substantial equity in the Property, have the parties discussed

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

9:30 AM

**CONT...**      **Stuart Malin and Patricia Malin**  
entering into an APO or entering into a Loan Modification?

**Chapter 13**

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Stuart Malin

Represented By  
Steven Abraham Wolvek

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Patricia Malin

Represented By  
Steven Abraham Wolvek

**Movant(s):**

Metropolitan Life Insurance

Represented By  
Daniel K Fujimoto  
Christopher Giacinto  
Sean C Ferry

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:00 AM

**1:21-11363 Doris E Melendez**

**Chapter 11**

**#4.00 Motion for relief from stay**

**THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON FKA**

Docket 39

**Tentative Ruling:**

Movant: Bank of NY Mellon  
Petition Date: 08/11/2021  
Chapter 11 - not confirmed  
Service: Proper; Opposition filed.  
Property: 628 North Montebello Blvd, Montebello, California 90640  
Property Value: \$600,000.00 (Per Debtor's Schedules)  
Amount Owed: \$927,542.60 (Per Movant's Papers).  
Equity Cushion: 0%  
Equity: \$0  
Post-Petition Delinquency: NA ( Debtor has missed 160 payments of \$3,307.85)

Movant seeks relief under 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1) and 362(d)(2) under the following paragraphs: 2 (proceed under applicable non-bankruptcy law); 3 (option to enter into forbearance agreement); and 7 (waiver of 4001(a)(3) stay). Movant asserts that cause exists for lifting the automatic stay because the Movant's interest in the Property is not adequately protected by an equity cushion. Movant asserts that there is no equity in the Property and the Property is not necessary for an effective reorganization.

Debtor opposes this motion on the grounds that the Debtor generates \$2,800.00 a month as rental income and intends to provide that to Movant as adequate protection payments while negotiating a consensual claim treatment. Further, Debtor argues that the Property is necessary for an effective reorganization. Debtor possess four properties which she is attempting to generate income from in order to effectively reorganize. Debtor does not contest the fact that there is no equity in the Property.



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:00 AM

**CONT...**

**Doris E Melendez**

**Chapter 11**

Creditor contends that this Court should grant its Motion for Relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) on the grounds that sufficient cause exists because Debtor has failed to make contractual payments due under the Subject Loan for 160 months with contractual payments in the approximate sum of \$511,896.41. Debtor does not contest the lack of equity in the Property. Creditor requested relief under §362(d)(2) based on the lack of equity in the Property. Debtor alleged the Property has a value of \$600,000.00 versus Movant's payoff of \$927,642.60. Although Creditor obtained an updated Appraisal Report listing a Property value of \$710,000.00, there is still insufficient equity in the Property. Further, the standard in a chapter 11 proceeding is a showing that "the property is essential for an effective reorganization that is in prospect." This means, that there must be "a reasonable possibility of a successful reorganization within a reasonable time." *United Sav. Ass'n. v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs.*, 484 U.S. 365, 376 (1988). Debtor has failed to submit any evidence to suggest the Property itself is absolutely necessary for an effective reorganization. Indeed, as the Property contains no equity, produces negative net income, provides no benefit to the estate; and is therefore unnecessary for the Debtor's effective reorganization. Further, the Debtor has failed to provide evidence that a successful reorganization is in prospect within a reasonable time. Notably, this is the Debtor's fourth bankruptcy case.

As to adequate protection, the net revenue the Property generates does not cover the monthly payments required to the Movant. Further, there is no equity in the Property either. Debtor has not provided the Court with evidence on how it intends to generate sufficient revenue to cover the gap between the revenue the Property generates and the monthly expenses.

Section 362(d)(2) requires the bankruptcy court, on request of a party in interest, to grant relief from the automatic stay when debtor has no equity in the property, and the property is not necessary to debtor's effective reorganization. While the burden of proof regarding the issue of lack of equity in the property is on the moving party, the debtor has the burden to prove the property is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g). Debtor failed to submit any viable evidence that this particular Property is necessary for an effective reorganization. The Property has no equity, the amount owed exceeds the value of the Property by a lot, and the Property is

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:00 AM

**CONT...      Doris E Melendez**

**Chapter 11**

generating a net loss. Accordingly, the Property is not necessary for an effective reorganization.

Disposition: Grant relief under 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1) and 362(d)(2) under the following paragraphs: 2 (proceed under applicable non-bankruptcy law); 3 (option to enter into forbearance agreement); and 7 (waiver of 4001(a)(3) stay).

Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Doris E Melendez

Represented By  
Lionel E Giron  
Joanne P. Sanchez

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:00 AM

**1:21-11366 Shawntrel C. Knight**

**Chapter 7**

**#5.00** Motion for relief from stay

CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE

Docket 22

**Tentative Ruling:**

Petition Date: 8/11/2021

Ch: 7

Service: Proper. No opposition filed.

Property: 2015 Land Rover Range Rover Evoque Pure Premium Sport U (VIN  
# SALVN2BG7FH06062)

Property Value: \$15,000.00 (per debtor's schedules)

Amount Owed: \$26,476.19

Equity Cushion: 0.0%

Equity: \$0.00.

Delinquency: \$16,818.63 (Prepetition and Postpetition Debt) (Monthly  
payments \$566.73)

Disposition: GRANT under 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1) and (d)(2). GRANT relief  
requested in paragraph 2 (proceed under applicable non-bankruptcy law) and  
6 (waiver of 4001(a)(3) stay).

NO APPEARANCE REQUIRED—RULING MAY BE MODIFIED AT  
HEARING.

MOVANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Shawntrel C. Knight

Represented By  
James D. Hornbuckle

**Trustee(s):**

Nancy J Zamora (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:00 AM

**CONT... Shawntrel C. Knight**

**Chapter 7**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:00 AM

**1:21-11412    Jose Carlos Nevarez**

**Chapter 13**

**#5.01    Motion By Debtor To Convert Chapter 13 Case To Chapter 11**

fr. 11/16/21

Docket      28

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\*    REASON: Moved to be heard at 10:30am**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Moved to 10:30am Calendar.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Jose Carlos Nevarez

Represented By  
Thomas B Ure

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:00 AM

**1:21-11482    Martha Perez**

**Chapter 13**

**#6.00      Motion for relief from stay**

**SHIRELY MARTINEZ, GUSTAVO ANDRES**

Docket      13

**Tentative Ruling:**

Movant: Shirely Martinez, Gustavo Andres

Petition Date: 09/07/2021

Chapter 13 - not confirmed

Service: Proper; No Opposition filed.

Property Address: 17825 Romer Street, Northridge CA 91325

Type of Property: Residential Property

Occupancy: Holdover Tenant

Foreclosure Sale: NA

UD case filed: 05/14/2021

UD Judgment: NA

Disposition: GRANT under 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1); (d)(2)). GRANT relief as requested in paragraphs 2 (proceed under non-bankruptcy law), 3 (confirmation no stay in effect) and 6 (waiver of 4001(a)(3) stay); 8 (order binding for 2 years if properly recorded); 9 (binding on any debtor who claims interest in Property for 180 days if recorded); 11 (Binding against Debtor for 180 days so no automatic stay shall rise).

**NO APPEARANCE REQUIRED—RULING MAY BE MODIFIED AT HEARING.**

**MOVANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS THAT SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE:**

"Moratoriums not affected. This order does not terminate any moratorium on evictions, foreclosures or similar relief. Nothing in this order should be

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:00 AM

**CONT... Martha Perez**

**Chapter 13**

construed as making any findings of fact or conclusions of law regarding the existence of, or merits of any dispute regarding, any such moratorium."

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Martha Perez

Pro Se

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**1:21-11412 Jose Carlos Nevarez**

**Chapter 13**

**#7.00 Motion for relief from stay**

OSM LOAN ACAUISITIONS, IX LP

fr.10/20/21

Docket 23

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Court continued this RFS so that Debtor could obtain an appraisal. Debtor obtained an appraisal on the Property. Dkt. No. 34. The appraisal shows the Debtor has about 16% equity cushion in the Property. Are parties amendable to APO?

Appearance Required

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Jose Carlos Nevarez

Represented By  
Nathan A Berneman

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**1:21-11412 Jose Carlos Nevarez**

**Chapter 13**

**#7.01 Motion By Debtor To Convert Chapter 13 Case To Chapter 11**

fr. 11/16/21

Docket 28

**Tentative Ruling:**

Debtor moves to convert this case from a chapter 13 to a chapter 11. OSM Loan Acquisitions IX, LP ("Secured Creditor") opposes.

Section 1307(d), which governs the Motion to Convert, states:

Except as provided in subsection (f) of this section, at any time before the confirmation of a plan under section 1325 of this title, on request of a party in interest or the United States trustee and after notice and a hearing, the court may convert a case under this Chapter to a case under Chapter 11 or 12 of this title.

11 U.S.C. § 1307(d). Unlike other provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, section 1307(d) "lack[s] any specific guidance . . . [on] what standard exists to guide or limit the court's discretion." *In re Lester*, 409 B.R. 364, 370 (W.D. Va. 2009); see also *In re Tsung Yu Chien*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 126601 \* 8 (C.D. Cal. 2020). While this discretion afforded by section 1307(d) is undoubtedly not "limitless," it is much broader than the discretion afforded by those sections that enumerate relevant considerations. *Lester* at 370. ("While this Court does not understand the lack of specific guidance within Section 1307(d) to mean that the discretion of the Court in considering motions to convert brought under its authority is limitless, this Court is also not persuaded that it should read into Section 1307(d) those factors contained in other sections of the Code which govern motions to convert from or to cases under different Chapters.")

Debtor seeks a conversion because he would not be able to propose a feasible Chapter 13 plan which would require either the full amount of the matured not to be paid or the value of the apartment building if the subject loan is unsecured. The Secured Creditor opposes the motion on the that the Debtor has failed to establish that there is a likelihood of successful

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**CONT...**      **Jose Carlos Nevarez**  
reorganization.

**Chapter 13**

In Chien, the Bankruptcy Court denied the debtor's motion to convert under section 1307(d) because he "failed 'to establish that there is a likelihood of successful reorganization.'" Id. at \*9. In affirming the Bankruptcy Court's ruling, the District Court reasoned that "Chapter 11 requires a reorganization of a debtor's assets[.]" and "[i]f [the debtor] could not reorganize, conversion to Chapter 11 would be futile." Id. As such, the Bankruptcy Court did not abuse its discretion in denying the debtor's motion to convert. Id.

The Debtor has not confirmed a chapter 13 plan and the case is still relatively newer; however, conversion under 1307(d) is not a right of the Debtor, it is at this Court's discretion. Debtor's motion is barebones and does not mention how a Chapter 11 case would benefit the Debtor. Rather, the motion focuses more on how chapter 13 is inadequate. Debtor failed to file reply brief to Secured Creditor's opposition.

Debtor needs to provide the Court with information on what he intends to do in a chapter 11 and whether this conversion will be futile.

Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Jose Carlos Nevarez

Represented By  
Thomas B Ure

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:30 AM

**1:21-11544    The Harman Press Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#8.00    U.S. Trustee Motion to dismiss or convert case Under 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)**

Docket      31

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

The Harman Press Inc.

Represented By  
Thomas B Ure

**Trustee(s):**

John-Patrick McGinnis Fritz (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**1:21-11544 The Harman Press Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#8.01** Status Conference of Chapter 11, Subchapter V Case; and (2) Requiring Report on Status of Chapter 11, Subchapter V Case.

fr. 11/3/21

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

Proposed claim bar date: \_\_\_\_\_

Objections to claims deadline: \_\_\_\_\_

Avoidance actions deadline: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed disclosure statement filing deadline: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed disclosure statement hearing: \_\_\_\_\_

**DEBTOR TO LODGE SCHEDULING ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS OF THE  
INITIAL STATUS CONFERENCE**

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

The Harman Press Inc.

Represented By  
Thomas B Ure

**Trustee(s):**

John-Patrick McGinnis Fritz (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**1:20-12088 Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien**

**Chapter 11**

**#9.00 Debtor-In-Possession's Motion to Confirm  
First Amended Chapter 11 Plan of  
Reorganization**

Docket 82

**Tentative Ruling:**

Debtor is a currently employed by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department as a Building Complex Manager. The major assets of the debtor are three (3) real properties as follows: (1) 13458 Vose St, Valley Glen, CA 91405 (Single Family Residence) (2) 12010 Dresden Place, Granada Hills, CA 91344 (Single Family Residence - Rental property) (3) 13507 Hart Street, Van Nuys, CA 91405 (Single Family Residence – Rental property) Debtor fell ill with a chronic disease which led him to stop working and fall behind on his mortgage payments. On August 31, 2021, the Court entered an order approving the disclosure statement. Dkt No. 71.

The court will only confirm a plan if it “complies with the applicable provisions of this title.” 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(1). A plan complies with the applicable provisions of chapter 11 when it properly classifies the claims or interests and contains all mandatory provisions. See 11 U.S.C. §§1122, 1123; See also, *Acequia, Inc., v. Clinton*, (In re *Acequia, Inc.*), 787 F.2d 1352 (9th Cir. 1986); *Technical Knockout*, 833 F.2d 797, 803 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the first question is whether the plan properly classifies claims and interests as provided in §1122. The plan satisfies this requirement.

The second question is whether the plan contains all mandatory provisions of §1123. Section 1123 designates the required contents of the plan, as well as other provisions which are not required but may be included in the plan. Section 1123(a)(1) requires the plan to classify claims other than administrative priority claims and priority tax claims. The plan satisfies this requirement by properly designating classes.

Section 1123(a)(2) requires the plan to specify any class of claims or interests that is unimpaired under the plan. The plan satisfies this requirement.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**CONT... Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien**

**Chapter 11**

Section 1123(a)(3) requires the plan to specify the treatment of any class of claims or interests that is impaired under the plan. The plan satisfies this requirement.

Section 1123(a)(4) requires that the plan provide the same treatment for each claim or interest in a particular class, except where a member of a particular class agrees to less favorable treatment. The Plan specifies identical treatment of all claims and interests in a class unless a holder agrees to a different or less favorable treatment.

Section 1123(a)(5) requires that the plan provide “adequate means for the plan’s implementation . . . .” 11 U.S.C. §1123(a)(5). The cash flow of the debtor is sufficient to fund the plan. The Disclosure statement indicates that the monies will be applied to pay administrative and priority claimants, and that the balance will be used to fund the ongoing operation of the Debtor. The Debtor will have sufficient cash on hand to make payments required on confirmation.

Section 1123(a)(6) requires that, with respect to a corporate debtor, a chapter 11 plan provide for the inclusion in the Debtor’s charter a prohibition against the issuance of non-voting equity securities and related protections for holder of preferred shares. 11 U.S.C. §1123(a)(6). This provision is not applicable to Debtor.

Section 1123(a)(7) provides that a plan must “contain only provisions that are consistent with the interests of creditors and equity security holders and with public policy with respect to the manner of selection of any officer, director, or trustee under the plan and any successor to such officer, director or trustee.” This requirement is not applicable

Section 1123(a)(8) specifies that individual debtors must use future income to fund the plan. The Debtor herein, is using future income to fund the Plan and this requirement is therefore fulfilled.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(2)

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**CONT... Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien**

**Chapter 11**

The court will only confirm a plan if the “proponent of the plan complies with the applicable provisions of this title.” 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(2). This requirement is designed to ensure that the plan proponent has made the appropriate disclosures and complied with the solicitation requirements set forth in §1125. *Andrew v. Coppersmith (In re Downtown Inv. Club III)*, 89 B.R. 59, 65 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1988). Debtor has filed schedules, appeared at hearings, filed a disclosure statement and plan of reorganization; thereby he has satisfied the requirements of the code.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(3)

The plan must be proposed in good faith and not by any means forbidden by law. 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(3); see *In re Stolrow's Inc.*, 84 B.R. 167 (Bankr. 9th Cir. 1988). There is a presumption that a plan was filed in good faith if no objections are filed. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3020(b). If the presumption in Rule 3020(b) arises, then the court need receive evidence on the issue of good faith. *Id.* The § 1129(a)(3) good faith question is determined on a case-by-case basis taking into account the totality of the circumstances with a view to whether the plan will fairly achieve a result consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Bankruptcy Code. *Platinum Capital, Inc. v. Sylmar Plaza, Ltd. P'ship (In re Sylmar Plaza, Ltd. P'ship)*, 314 F.3d 1070, 1074- 75 (9th Cir. 2002).

The proposal of the Plan is consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Bankruptcy Code and was made with honesty and good intentions and with a basis for expecting that, under the circumstances, it was the best means for maximizing any recovery by creditors of the Debtor.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(4)

Any payment to be made by a plan proponent, debtor, or person issuing securities or acquiring property under the plan, for services or costs in connection with the case or in connection with the plan and incident to the case, must be approved by the court as reasonable. 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(4). In this case, the debtor disclosed pre-petition retainer paid to the professionals and such retainer has been approved (Docket No. 79) Debtor's counsel will be filing a Fee Application on or before November 30, 2021.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**CONT... Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien**

**Chapter 11**

Thus, the Plan complies with section 1129(a) (4).

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(5)

§1129(a)(5) requires: (i) that the proponent of a plan disclose the identity of any individual proposed to serve after confirmation as a director, officer, or voting trustee of debtor, (ii) that the appointment of such individuals be consistent with the interests of creditors and shareholders and with public policy, and (iii) that the proponent disclose the nature of any insider that will be employed by the Debtor and the nature of the compensation to be provided to such an insider. Not applicable here.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(6)

§1129(a)(6) requires that any regulatory commission with jurisdiction over the rates of a debtor approve any changes in rate regulations. Not applicable here

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(7)

The plan proponent must demonstrate that either each member of impaired class has either accepted plan or will receive as much if debtor liquidated in a chapter 7. 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(7). This is known as the “best interests” of the creditors test. In this case, conversion of this chapter 11 case to a chapter 7 liquidation case would result in additional delay and expense and would reopen the bar date for filing claims. Debtor’s plan proposes to pay all claims in full (100%) to those creditors whose allowed claims is \$1,500.00 or less or who elects to reduce its allowed claim to \$1,500.00 on a single payment equal to 100% of its allowed claim on, or as soon as practicable after, the Effective Date of the Plan. See Article II of the Plan. Accordingly, under the Plan, any recovery by creditors will exceed that which would occur in a chapter 7 liquidation.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(8)

The plan proponent must show that each class has either accepted the plan or is unimpaired. 11 U.S.C. 1129(a)(8). Otherwise, the plan proponent must



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:30 AM

**CONT...      Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien**

**Chapter 11**

"Cram Down" the rejecting class. 11 U.S.C. §1129(b); see infra, "Cram Down;" see also, In re M. Long Arabians, 103 B.R. 211, 215 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1989). Failure to vote does not constitute acceptance of the plan. A class must affirmatively vote to accept the plan. In re Townco Realty Inc., 81 B.R. 707, 708 (Bankr. S.D.Fla. 1987). A class of claims has accepted a plan if it has been accepted by creditors that hold at least two-thirds in amount and more than one-half in number of the allowed claims of such class. 11 U.S.C. §1126(c). Section 1129(b)(1), a plan can be confirmed despite the non-acceptance of Class 6 claims where the Plan does not discriminate unfairly and is fair and equitable with respect to the rejecting Class. In this case, the Plan does not require a cram down, and the plan as proposed is fair and equitable. Also, Class 6 claims are treated equally, Debtor proposes a 100% to the 6(a) claim. and the plan should be confirmed under this Section.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(9)

The plan can only be confirmed if administrative claimants are paid in full on the effective date unless otherwise agreed. 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(9)(A). The plan may make deferred cash payments to accepting holders of non-priority tax claims, while rejecting holders of such claims must be paid the amount of their allowed claim on the effective date. Id. at §1129(a)(9)(B)(i)-(ii). However, the plan may make deferred cash payments to holders of allowed priority tax claims so long as the claimants will receive an amount equal to the allowed amount of the claim as of the effective date, over a period of not more than five years from the petition date. Id. at §1129(a)(9)(C). Debtor will pay any outstanding administrative fees upon approval of fees and on the effective date.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(10)

At least one class of claims that is impaired under the plan must accept the plan, exclusive of any acceptance by a plan insider. 11 U.S.C. 1129(a)(10). In this case, Class 2(c) has accepted the plan, therefore, the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 1129(a) (10) are satisfied.

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(11)

The court may only confirm a plan if it is feasible, meaning that confirmation is

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:30 AM

**CONT...      Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien**

**Chapter 11**

not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor . . . .” 11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(11); *Pizza of Hawaii, Inc. v. Shakey's, Inc.*, (In re *Pizza of Hawaii, Inc.*), 761 F.2d 1374 (9th Cir. 1985). Feasibility is demonstrated where the plan has a “reasonable probability of success.” In re *Acequia, Inc.*, 787 F.2d at 1364.

The payments will be funded in part by rent and proceeds of the rental property and debtor’s regular income. Finally, the Plan is feasible and not likely to be followed by the need for further reorganization or liquidation. Thus, the Plan is based on reality, and it is not a mere visionary scheme. For these reasons, the Plan satisfies the feasibility requirement of Section 1129(a) (11).

11 U.S.C. §1129(a)(12)

Section 1129(a)(12) requires that all fees payable under 28 U.S.C. §1930 are paid or will be paid on effective date. The Debtor believes that all such fees have been paid on a current basis and that no obligations in their regard will exist on the Effective Date of the Plan. In the event that any such fees are owing on the Effective Date they would be nominal in the context of the Plan, and they will be paid. Thus, the requirement of section 1129(a) (12) is satisfied.

The Court finds the Debtor has satisfied all the requirements to confirm the Plan. No opposition has been filed. The Court will Confirm the Plan.

Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Godwin Osaigbovo Iserhien

Represented By  
Onyinye N Anyama  
Diana Torres-Brito

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:30 AM

**1:21-11374    Energy Enterprises USA Inc. dba Canopy Energy**

**Chapter 11**

**#10.00    First Interim Fee Application of Michael Jay Berger  
for Michael Jay Berger, Debtor's Attorney,**

Period: 8/13/2021 to 10/10/2021,  
Fee: \$27,847.00,  
Expenses: \$406.17.

Docket      60

**Tentative Ruling:**

Service proper. No objections filed. Having reviewed Michael Jay Berger's Application for Approval of Compensation and Reimbursement of Costs, the Court finds that the fees and costs were necessary and reasonable, and are approved as requested.

APPLICANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS.  
NO APPEARANCES REQUIRED.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Energy Enterprises USA Inc. dba

Represented By  
Michael Jay Berger

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

10:30 AM

**1:20-11470    Afsaneh Kaviani**

**Chapter 7**

**#11.00**    Trustee's Final Report and Application for  
Compensation and Deadline to Object

Trustee:  
Nancy Zamora

Accountant for Trustee:  
SLBIGGS & Co.

Docket      70

**Tentative Ruling:**

Service proper. No opposition filed. Having reviewed the Trustee's Final Report, the Court finds that the fees and costs are reasonable and are approved as requested.

TRUSTEE TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS

APPEARANCES WAIVED ON 11/17/2021.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Afsaneh Kaviani

Represented By  
Fari B Nejadpour

**Trustee(s):**

Nancy J Zamora (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**1:20-12278 Master Road Service, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**#12.00** Trustee's Final Report and Application for  
Compensation and Deadline to Object

Trustee:  
Nancy Zamora

Accountant for Trustee:  
SLBIGGS & Co.

Docket 28

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Amended Trustee's Final Report filed - Doc.  
#32. If**

**Tentative Ruling:**

On November 8, 2021, Trustee filed an amended Trustee's Final Report and Applications for compensation. Therefore, this final report and application is vacated.

No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Master Road Service, Inc.

Represented By  
Eric Bensamochan

**Trustee(s):**

Nancy J Zamora (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

10:30 AM

**1:20-12278 Master Road Service, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**#12.01** Trustee's Financial Report and Applications  
for Compensation and Deadline to Object

Trustee:  
Nancy Zamora

Accountant for Trustee:  
SLBIGGS & Co.

Docket 32

**Tentative Ruling:**

Service proper. No opposition filed. Having reviewed the Trustee's Final Report, the Court finds that the fees and costs are reasonable and are approved as requested.

TRUSTEE TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS

APPEARANCES WAIVED ON 11/17/2021.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Master Road Service, Inc.

Represented By  
Eric Bensamochan

**Trustee(s):**

Nancy J Zamora (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

11:00 AM

**1:19-12102    Hawkeye Entertainment, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#13.00**    Motion of Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession  
for an Order Pursuant to Section 364(c) of the  
Bankruptcy Code Authorizing the Debtor to  
Obtain Post-Petition Financing on a Permanent  
Basis

fr. 6/9/21; 7/28/21, 9/8/21

Docket      327

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Court continued the hearing because the final documents had not come in. What is the status of final documents?

Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Hawkeye Entertainment, LLC

Represented By  
Sandford L. Frey

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

11:00 AM

**1:19-12102    Hawkeye Entertainment, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

Adv#: 1:21-01064      Hawkeye Entertainment, LLC et al v. Chang et al

- #14.00**    Status Conference re: Preliminary Injunction Relief
- 2) Temporary Restraining Order
  - 3) Breach of Contract
  - 4) Breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing
  - 5) Breach of implied covenant of quiet enjoyment
  - 6) Negligent interference with prospective economic advantage
  - 7) Intentional interference with prospective economic advantage
  - 8) Intentional interference with contractual relations

Docket      1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\*    REASON: Case dismissed on 11/10/2021**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Vacated. Case Dismissed on 11/10/2021. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Hawkeye Entertainment, LLC

Represented By  
Sandford L. Frey

**Defendant(s):**

Michael Chang

Pro Se

Smart Capital Investments I, LLC,

Pro Se

Top Properties Corporation

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Hawkeye Entertainment, LLC

Represented By  
Sandford L. Frey

WERM Investments LLC

Represented By  
Sandford L. Frey



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:19-12322 M Shah Dental Inc**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01057 Zamora, Chapter 7 Trustee v. American Express Company, a New York

- #15.00** Status Conference Re: Complaint for  
(1) Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C.  
§ 548(a)(1)(A)];  
(2) Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C.  
§ 548(a)(1)(B)]; and  
(3) Recovery of Avoided Transfer [11 U.S.C. § 550]

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

This is a fraudulent transfer action. Defendant has filed an answer to the complaint.

The parties do not wish to attend mediation at this time but possibly after some discovery is conducted if voluntary settlement negotiations are not successful.

Discovery cut-off (all discovery to be completed\*):\_\_April 1, 2022\_\_

Expert witness designation deadline (if necessary):\_\_\_\_\_N/A\_\_\_\_\_

Case dispositive motion filing deadline (MSJ; 12(c)):\_\_ \_April 6, 2022  
\_\_\_\_\_

Pretrial conference:\_\_\_\_May 4, 2022\_\_ 11:00\_\_\_\_\_

Deadline for filing pretrial stipulation (14 days before pretrial conference) :  
\_\_\_\_\_ April 20, 2022\_\_\_\_\_

No Appearance Required. Plaintiff to lodge order with court within 7 days.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

M Shah Dental Inc

Represented By  
Shirlee L Bliss

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

11:00 AM

**CONT...      M Shah Dental Inc**

**Chapter 7**

**Defendant(s):**

American Express Company, a New      Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Nancy J. Zamora, Chapter 7 Trustee      Represented By  
Meghann A Triplett

**Trustee(s):**

Nancy J Zamora (TR)      Represented By  
Noreen A Madoyan  
Jeremy Faith

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:19-12322 M Shah Dental Inc**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01061 Zamora, Chapter 7 Trustee v. Nshanyan

- #16.00** Status Conference Re: Complaint for:  
(1) Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfer [11 U.S.C.  
§ 548(a)(1)(A)];  
(2) Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfer [11 U.S.C.  
§ 548(a)(1)(B)]; and  
(3) Recovery of Avoided Transfer [11 U.S.C. § 550]

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Defendant has not filed an answer to the Complaint. On November 10, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Request for Clerk to Enter Default Under LBR 7055-1(a) (Adv. Dkt. No. 10) and intends to file a Motion for Default Judgment following entry of default. The Court finds cause to continue this matter to February 16, 2022 at 11:00am to allow Plaintiff to file a motion for default judgment.

No Appearance Required on 11/17/2021.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

M Shah Dental Inc

Represented By  
Shirlee L Bliss

**Defendant(s):**

Hasmik Nshanyan

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Nancy J. Zamora, Chapter 7 Trustee

Represented By  
Meghann A Triplett

**Trustee(s):**

Nancy J Zamora (TR)

Represented By  
Noreen A Madoyan

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**CONT...**

**M Shah Dental Inc**

Jeremy Faith

**Chapter 7**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10324 Rooter Hero San Gabriel, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01032 Weil v. Akhoian et al

**#17.00** Status Conference re: Complaint to (1) Avoid and Recover Fraudulent Transfer; and (2) to Preserve Recovered Transfer for Benefit of Debtor's Estate [11 U.S.C. § 544 and California Civil Code § 3439 et. seq. and 11 U.S.C. §§ 548 and 550] - Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)), (14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

fr. 8/18/21; 9/8/21; 10/20/21

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Stip. cont. to 1/5/22 at 11am**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to January 5, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Rooter Hero San Gabriel, Inc.

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

John Akhoian

Pro Se

Plumber Hero, Inc.

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Diane C. Weil

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Diane C Weil (TR)

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10325 RHSF, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01034 Weil v. Akhoian et al

**#18.00** Status Conference Re:Complaint to:  
(1) Avoid and Recover Fraudulent Transfer; and  
(2) to Preserve Recovered Transfer for Benefit  
of Debtor's Estate [11 U.S.C. § 544 and California  
Civil Code § 3439 et. seq. and 11 U.S.C. §§ 548  
and 550]

fr. 8/18/21; 9/8/21; 10/20/21

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Stip. Cont. to 1/5/22 at 11am**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to 1/5/22 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

RHSF, Inc.

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

John Akhoian

Pro Se

RH BAS, Inc.

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Diane C. Weil

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Diane C Weil (TR)

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10326 Rooter Hero 9, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01033 Weil v. Akhoian et al

**#19.00** Status Conference re: Complaint to (1) Avoid and Recover Fraudulent Transfer; and (2) to Preserve Recovered Transfer for Benefit of Debtor's Estate [11 U.S.C. § 544 and California Civil Code § 3439 et. seq. and 11 U.S.C. §§ 548 and 550]  
Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),  
(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

fr. 8/18/21; 9/8/21; 10/20/21

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Stip. cont. to 1/5/22 at 11am**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to January 5, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Rooter Hero 9, Inc.

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

John Akhoian

Pro Se

Plumber Hero, Inc.

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Diane C. Weil

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Diane C Weil (TR)

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10327 Rooter Hero of Ventura, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01030 Goldman v. Akhoian et al

**#20.00** Status Conference re: Complaint to (1) Avoid and Recover Fraudulent Transfer; and (2) to Preserve Recovered Transfer for Benefit of Debtor's Estate [11 U.S.C. § 544 and California Civil Code § 3439 et. seq. and 11 U.S.C. §§ 548 and 550] - Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)), (14 (Recovery of money/property - other.

fr. 8/18/21, 9/8/21; 10/20/21

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Stip. cont. to 1/5/22 at 11am**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to January 5, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Rooter Hero of Ventura, LLC

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

John Akhoian

Pro Se

RH LAN, Inc.

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Amy L. Goldman

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Amy L Goldman (TR)

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

Diane C Weil

Pro Se



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10328    RHSFND**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01031      Goldman v. Akhoian et al

**#21.00**    Status Conference re: Complaint to (1) Avoid and Recover  
Fraudulent Transfer; and (2) to Preserve Recovered  
Transfer for Benefit of Debtor's Estate [11 U.S.C. § 544 and  
California Civil Code § 3439 et. seq. and 11 U.S.C. §§ 548 and 550]  
Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548  
fraudulent transfer)), (14 (Recovery of money/property - other)

fr. 8/18/21, 9/8/21; 10/20/21

Docket      1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\*    REASON: Cont. to 1/5/22 @11am**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to January 5, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

RHSFND

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

John Akhoian

Pro Se

RH LAN, Inc.

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Amy L. Goldman

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Amy L Goldman (TR)

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

Diane C Weil

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10577 Rooter Hero Plumbing, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01035 Goldman v. RH Orange, Inc. et al

**#22.00** Status Conference Re: Complaint to:  
(1) Avoid and Recover Fraudulent Transfers;  
(2) Avoid and Recover Post-Petition Transfers;  
(3) to Preserve Recovered Transfers for Benefit  
of Debtors Estate;  
(4) Permanent Injunction;  
(5) Trademark Infringement; and  
(6) Turnover of Property of the Estate

fr. 8/18/21 9/8/21; 10/8/21

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd to 1/5/22 at 11:00 a.m. per Order  
#38. If**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to January 5, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Rooter Hero Plumbing, Inc.

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

RH Orange, Inc.

Pro Se

Call Pro's, Inc.

Pro Se

John Akhoian

Pro Se

RH BAS, Inc.

Pro Se

RH LAN, Inc.

Pro Se

Plumber Hero, Inc.

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room      302**

11:00 AM

**CONT...      Rooter Hero Plumbing, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**Plaintiff(s):**

Amy L. Goldman

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Amy L Goldman (TR)

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

Diane C. Weil

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:20-10577 Rooter Hero Plumbing, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 1:21-01035 Goldman v. RH Orange, Inc. et al

**#23.00** Motion of Chapter 7 Trustee for Preliminary  
Injunction

fr. 6/24/21, 8/18/21, 9/8/21;10/8/21

Docket 2

\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd to 1/5/22 at 11:00 a.m. per Order  
#38. If

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to January 5, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Rooter Hero Plumbing, Inc.

Represented By  
David S Hagen

**Defendant(s):**

RH Orange, Inc.

Pro Se

Call Pro's, Inc.

Pro Se

John Akhoian

Pro Se

RH BAS, Inc.

Pro Se

RH LAN, Inc.

Pro Se

Plumber Hero, Inc.

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Amy L. Goldman

Represented By  
Anthony A Friedman

**Trustee(s):**

Amy L Goldman (TR)

Represented By

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Rooter Hero Plumbing, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Anthony A Friedman

Diane C. Weil

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
San Fernando Valley  
Chief Judge Maureen Tighe, Presiding  
Courtroom 302 Calendar**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

**Hearing Room 302**

11:00 AM

**1:21-10865 Starr F Taxman**

**Chapter 13**

Adv#: 1:21-01059 Kurtz v. Taxman

**#24.00** Status Conference re: Complaint 1) Non-Dischargeability of debt 523(a)(2)(A)  
2 Non-Dischargeability - 523(a)(4),  
3) Non-Dischargeability - 523(a)(6),  
4) Non-Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), - Conversion and  
5) Determination that Bankruptcy is Nondischargeable - 727(a)(4)(A)

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd to 6/1/22 at 10:30 a.m. If**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continued to June 1, 2022 at 11:00am. No Appearance Required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Starr F Taxman

Represented By  
Stella A Havkin

**Defendant(s):**

Starr F Taxman

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Gary Alan Kurtz

Represented By  
Stephen L Burton

**Trustee(s):**

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se